

Appendix C
Alternatives to the Proposed Rules Offered at Public Hearing

Alternatives

Amount and Schedule of Mercury Reductions	Growth in Mercury Emissions	Evaluation Report	Other Comments
<p>2006 – 25% 2010 – 90%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • With trading require 90% mercury reductions by 2008. • Reduction requirement applies to all utilities and government owned boilers with more than 10 pounds of mercury emissions in one year including chlor-alkali plants, medical waste incinerators, municipal waste incinerators and other significant sources. • Include a provision for the virtual elimination of mercury 20 years after rule promulgation. 	<p>Offsets 1.5 : 1.0</p> <p>Require mercury emission reductions equal to 150% of the annual mercury emission increase from any new source or modification of an existing source. Applies without a lower mercury emission threshold of 10 pounds.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Propose that an alternative should be the eight rule elements in the citizen petition. This includes a comprehensive mercury program, appointment of a mercury control council, establishment of baseline emissions for sources, setting emission caps and a 1.5:1.0 offset for any new emission sources, reductions from utilities and other major sources in two-phases, establishment of fines and disincentives for non-compliance and a variance provision that could provide a two-year suspension of rule requirements. • Additionally propose that a mercury containing product reduction program not be included and that the ability to meet emission reduction requirements by obtaining emission reductions from others be limited to 20%.

Amount and Schedule of Mercury Reductions	Growth in Mercury Emissions	Evaluation Report	Other Comments
<p>2007 – 10% 2012 – 40%</p> <p>or</p> <p>Multi-pollutant Reduction Program Alternative</p> <p>Addition of a compliance alternative that would allow a major utility the opportunity to propose a multi-pollutant reduction program instead of achieving the mercury reduction requirements in the rules. Mercury reductions would still need to be an element of the proposal, which would also require a commitment to provide other environmental benefits beyond existing laws and rules. The proposal would also need to include a schedule to accomplish the alternative program. The alternative program would be subject to a public hearing.</p>	<p>Latest Available Control Technology</p> <p>Instead of emission offsets establish a mercury control technology requirement for new sources and modifications of existing sources with substantial mercury emissions.</p>		

Amount and Schedule of Mercury Reductions	Growth in Mercury Emissions	Evaluation Report	Other Comments
<p>Voluntary Program</p>	<p>Latest Available Control Technology with Determination of Environmental Benefits</p> <p>Require mercury control technology based on a finding that resources benefit from the reductions that would be achieved.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Clearly state in rules that the requirements i.e. caps, offsets do not apply to sources covered by a MACT standard. Eliminate or substantially increase threshold of caps for major sources. If there are major source caps apply them on a unit, not facility basis. Do not set limits on the use of certified emission reduction credits. Include rule language that mandates that the state proposal be consistent and no more stringent than the federal MACT for utilities.

Filename: Appendix C - Alternatives to the Proposed Rules.doc
Directory: Y:\org\aw\air\reg\mercury\CACreport
Template: C:\Program Files\Microsoft Office\Templates\Normal.dot
Title: Organization
Subject:
Author: heinrj
Keywords:
Comments:
Creation Date: 06/24/02 3:35 PM
Change Number: 5
Last Saved On: 09/17/02 11:53 AM
Last Saved By: Jon Heinrich
Total Editing Time: 16 Minutes
Last Printed On: 09/20/02 3:50 PM
As of Last Complete Printing
Number of Pages: 4
Number of Words: 482 (approx.)
Number of Characters: 2,750 (approx.)